

SRI D. K. NAIKAR.—It is only the proposed amendment. It is not in existence now. So, we have sought for certain clarifications from the Board. The question of taking undue advantage does not arise.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಚ್. ಜಯಪ್ರಕಾಶ್ ನಾರಾಯಣ್.—ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಮತ್ತು ಮೈಸೂರು ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬಡವರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊಸ ನಿಯಮಾವಳಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಆದರೆ ಬಡವರಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕವರು ಗೊತ್ತಾದ ಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಸೈಟಿನ ಬೆಲೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡದೇ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಇವತ್ತು ಅವರು ಸೈಟನ್ನು ಕಳೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳತಕ್ಕ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತೆ ಅಲಾಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಿಯಮಾವಳಿಯನ್ನು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವೇ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ಕೆ. ನಾಯ್ಕರ್.—೧೯೭೪ ರಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿದ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ವೀಕರ್ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಎಂದು ಇಲ್ಲ. ಕೆಲವು ಸ್ಪೆಸಿಫಿಕ್‌ಗೆ ಪ್ರೊವಿಷನ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ, ಅಂಥವರಿಗಲ್ಲಾ ಅಭಯಾಕವಾಗಿದೆ. ಅವರು ಯಾರು ಎಂದರೆ,

Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, Other Backward Classes, nomadic tribes, wandering tribe, denotified tribes, defence personnel and other disabled persons during the recent war whose annual income from all sources does not exceed Rs. 5000.

ಆ ಎಲ್ಲ ಜನರಿಗೆ ೩ ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟ್ ಚಾರ್ಜ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಇದೆ. ಈಗ ಪ್ರಪೋಸ್ಡ್ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಇದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ೩ ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟ್ ಇಂಟರ್‌ಸ್ಟ್ ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಬೇಕು, ೬ ವರ್ಷದ ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ by monthly instalment, quarterly instalment and lumpsum recovery ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಇದೆ.

SRI DOPDATHIMMAIAH.—There is a lacuna in your rules in the Trust Board Rules. When a private lay out is sanctioned, the party has to pay lay out charges within a specified time. If he does not pay, they charge interest. After he pays lay out charges, for months and years together they do not make the lay out, but they collect interest, for having paid the money late. You don't make the lay out for years together and you earn interest out of the money he deposits. Can you do something to remove this lacuna ?

SRI D. K. NAIKAR.—There is also a proposal to amend the rules charging 15 per cent interest in such cases.

*Refund of 50 per cent of A.D.A. to Retired Government Employees*

357. Sri V. N. PATIL (Humnabad)—

Will the Minister for Finance and Housing be pleased to state :—

(a) whether the Government is aware of the fact that 50 per cent of the additional dearness allowance sanctioned to state Government Employees from 1-10-1974 and onwards is being compulsorily deposited under the Additional Emoluments (Compulsory Deposit) Act, 1974 ;

(b) if so, whether the Government is aware that the Government, Employees retiring after 1-10-1974 have to wait for 2 years to get back the 50 per cent of the of the amount so compulsorily deposited ;

(c) if so, with a view to help the retiring employees, whether Government would take action to see that the deposited amount is repaid on the date of their retirement;

(d) if not, what are the reasons?

SRI M. Y. GHORPADE (Minister for Finance and Housing).—

(a) Yes.

(b) The retired Government Employees need not wait for 2 years. Provision has been made in the Act to repay the whole of the amount standing to the credit of an employee on his superannuation or termination of his employment.

(c) Does not arise.

(d) Does not arise.

SRI V. N. PATIL.—While answering my question (b), you have said that the retired Government Employees need not wait for two years. There is a doubt in my mind whether there was any such circular that the retired Government Employees should wait for two years, to recollect the benefits which accrue to them. If there is any circular, I would like to know whether Government propose to withdraw it.

† SRI M. Y. GHORPADE.—There has been no circular. I don't know how the hon. Member got that impression. This is a Central Act and it has been made clear in the Act itself that this difficulty will not arise. In the third proviso of Sub-Section (1) of Section 9 of the Act, provision has been made for payment of the whole amount in his personal deposit account on his superannuation, resignation or termination of employment. It has been very clearly stated in the Act. Therefore, I don't know how the hon. Member got this impression.

*Death of Lady in Ex-MLA's Residence in Gulbarga*

862. SRI S. BANGARAPPA (Sorab)

Will the Chief Minister be pleased to state :—

(a) whether it is a fact that a lady by name Smt. Ningavva died in the residential house of one Ex-M.L.A., Shri Shankar Shetty Patil in Gulbarga District a few months back;

(b) whether there was any agitation by the public demanding enquiry into the matter, as it was alleged that the death was under mysterious circumstances;

(c) the action the Government has taken to detect the cause of the death?

L: A: